



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/668,548

09/23/2003

Kuen-Chu Lai

U 014819-1

2919

140

7590

07/17/2006

LADAS & PARRY
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10023

EXAMINER

TRAN, VINCENT HUY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2115

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/668,548	Applicant(s) LAI, KUEN-CHU	
	Examiner Vincent T. Tran	Art Unit 2115	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed on May 1, 2006.
2. Claims 1-2, 4-8 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
6. Claim 1-2, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huggins et al U.S. Patent 5,894,551 ("Huggins") in view of Raptor AT "Mother board Installation Guide" Third Edition August 2001 ("Raptor").
7. As per claim 1, Huggins discloses a apparatus for data safety, comprising:

a power switch device [28 fig. 1], having a first power output [174 fig. 1] and a second power output [144 fig. 1], for switching an input power to ensure that the first power output and side second power output do not supply power simultaneously [col. 2 lines 5-20; col. 3 lines 45-64];

a first network card [20 fig. 1], powered by said first power output of said power switch device [fig. 1];

a second network card [22 fig. 1], powered by said second power output of said power switch device [fig. 1];

and

a mother board is coupled to each of two different network cards, each of which is in turn connected to a separate storage device [abs] where in the first storage device [from col. 2 line 66 to col. 3 line 10], is powered by the first power output of the power switch device for storing the data sourced from the first network card [col. 3 lines 45-54] and the second storage device is powered by the second power output of the power switch device for storing data sourced from the second network card [col. 3 lines 66] and for activating another operating system [inherent].

In another word, Huggins discloses a computer system having a motherboard that capable of supporting at least two separate storage devices which are connected to two separate network cards [col. 2 lines 62-67] wherein the data sourced from different network cards can be physically separated so as to provide data security to the storage devices [abs].

Huggins does not disclose expressly that the motherboard is a dual DOC board.

Raptor discloses a dual DOC board which is well known in the art [Appendix C: disk-On-Chip page 53].

However, applicant has not disclosed that having a mother of dual DOC provides an advantage, it used to a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. Specifically, One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have recognized that the motherboard disclosed by Huggins encompassed different type of motherboards including the dual DOC board disclose by Raptor and Applicant because the special structure of the dual DOC board does not affect or limit the function perform by Huggins system, which is to provide data security for the internal storage devices.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replace the motherboard of Huggins with the dual DOC board of Raptor in view of their closely related structure to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1 which fails to patentably distinguish over the prior art of Huggins.

8. As per claim 2, Huggins discloses the machine address of the first network card and the second network card are each bound with an IP address [inherent].

9. As per claim 4, Raptor discloses the DOC is substituted by a disk on module [Appendix C: disk-On-Chip page 53].

10. As per claim 5, Huggins discloses an apparatus for data safety, comprising:
a power switch device [28 fig. 1], having a first power output [174 fig. 1] and a second power output [144 fig. 1], for switching an input power to cause said first power output and said second power output do not to be supplied simultaneously [col. 2 lines 5-20; col. 3 lines 45-64];

a first network card [20 fig. 1], powered by said first power output of said power switch device [174 fig. 1], the machine address of said first network card being bound with an IP address [inherent];

a second network card [22 fig. 1], powered by said second power output of said power switch device [144 fig. 1], the machine address of said second network card being bound with an IP address [inherent]; and

see further discussion in claim 1.

11. As per claim 6, Raptor discloses DOC is substituted by a disk on module [see claim 4].

12. As per claim 7, Raptor discloses DOC is substituted by a compact flash memory [Appendix C: disk-On-Chip page 53].

13. As per claim 8, Raptor discloses DOC is substituted by a compact flash memory [Appendix C: disk-On-Chip page 53].

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after


the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent T. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7210. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas c. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-3667. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Vincent Tran


THOMAS LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100